



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The right in the corpse has usually been defined as a right to "custody and possession," or as a "quasi-property right."¹¹ A recent Canadian case, however, goes further and bases its decision on the ground that the nearest relatives have a property right, limited to such exercise as shall conform to the duty out of which the rights arise. *Miner v. Canadian Pacific R. Co.*, 15 West. L. Rep. 161. And a late case in this country employs similar language.¹² The fact that a corpse is a physical thing and that the control of the nearest relative over it is exclusive¹³ predicates a right of property in the broadest use of that term.¹⁴ The principal case, however, recognizes that it would outrage decency and sentiments of reverence for the dead to regard that property right as absolute in its powers of disposition and transfer. An early *dictum* which did not so qualify it¹⁵ has been justly criticized as commercial,¹⁶ and most courts have preferred to speak only of a right of possession. Some considerations, however, indicate that it may be more accurate to regard a corpse as property subject to restrictions on its use. It is proper that a dead body should be the subject of larceny, and there is no reason, apart from the unwillingness of courts to use the word "property" in this connection, why it should not be so regarded. Moreover the restrictions upon the use of corpses as property vary in certain cases. In most states statutes provide for furnishing to medical institutions for purposes of dissection the bodies of executed felons and of those whose burial would be a public charge.¹⁷ Cadavers so acquired are obviously property in a much less restricted sense than bodies merely awaiting burial. Perhaps even less restricted is the control of corpses or parts thereof which are preserved for purposes of exhibition, such as monstrosities, skeletons, or mummies.¹⁸ Dead bodies in these forms are popularly regarded as property, because the reason for restricting the disposition of them has largely disappeared; and it would seem more consistent to regard every corpse as subject to property rights more or less limited according to the particular circumstances of its acquisition.

RECENT CASES.

ADVERSE POSSESSION — WHO MAY GAIN TITLE — WIFE AGAINST HUSBAND. — A husband on deserting his wife had given her an invalid deed to certain land. After occupying for the statutory period she conveyed to the plaintiff,

¹¹ *Keyes v. Konkel*, 119 Mich. 550, holding that replevin will not lie to recover a corpse.

¹² *Pettigrew v. Pettigrew*, 207 Pa. St. 313.

¹³ *Rousseau v. City of Troy*, 49 How. Pr. (N. Y.) 492, denying an action by a more distant relative.

¹⁴ See 1 SCHOULER, PERSONAL PROPERTY, 25; *Larson v. Chase*, 47 Minn. 307.

¹⁵ See *Bogert v. City of Indianapolis*, 13 Ind. 134.

¹⁶ See 10 HARV. L. REV. 51.

¹⁷ For typical statutes of this nature see 4 CONSOL. LAWS OF N. Y. (1909), Publ. Health Law, § 316; MASS. REV. LAWS (1902), 689-690; MICH. PUBLIC ACTS (1901), No. 5 (1); CODE OF TENN., § 6775.

¹⁸ *Doodeward v. Spence*, 9 N. S. W. 107, holding that detainee lies for the recovery of the body of a two-headed baby preserved in alcohol. But see an old case stated in 2 EAST P. C. 652. See 3 HALSBURY, LAWS OF ENGLAND, 405 note (r).

who sued to quiet title. The defendant claimed through the husband. By statute either spouse may sue the other to recover his or her separate property, and the accumulations of a wife are her separate property. *Held*, that the wife had gained title by adverse possession. *Union Oil Co. v. Stewart*, 110 Pac. 313 (Cal., Sup. Ct.).

Owing to the identity of interests and submersion of the wife's rights such a result would be entirely foreign to early common-law principles. Yet two jurisdictions hold that, the husband acquiescing, a wife may gain title by adverse possession without the aid of statutes. *Hartman v. Nettles*, 64 Miss. 495; *McPherson v. McPherson*, 75 Neb. 830. Others take the contrary view, since the land is jointly occupied and the husband remains the head of the family. *First National Bank of Santa Barbara v. Guerra*, 61 Cal. 109. But under a statute allowing the wife separate property, and a right to sue and be sued, she may recover from the husband for use and occupation of her land. *Skinner v. Skinner*, 38 Neb. 756. So title by adverse possession may be acquired where the parties are living apart under a void decree of divorce. *Warr v. Honeck*, 8 Utah 61. And without legislative enactment one state, at least, has relieved the wife of all marital disabilities on desertion by the husband. *Love v. Moynihan*, 16 Ill. 277. Such is the general rule when the husband abjures the realm. *Gregory v. Pierce*, 4 Met. (Mass.) 478. Since the basis of the rule as to disabilities disappears on abandonment by the husband, the principal case marks a justifiable step in the recognition of equal rights.

BANKRUPTCY — INVOLUNTARY PROCEEDINGS — WHEN DEBTOR MUST OWE \$1000. — An insolvent debtor owing over \$4000 made a general assignment, assented to by some of his creditors. The other creditors, whose claims aggregated less than \$1000, filed a petition to have him adjudged a bankrupt. The Bankruptcy Act of 1898, § 46, provides that "any natural person except a wage earner or person engaged chiefly in farming . . . owing debts to the amount of one thousand dollars or over may be adjudged an involuntary bankrupt." *Held*, that the petition should be granted. *In re Jacobson*, 181 Fed. 870 (Dist. Ct., D. Mass.).

Courts have generally held that the time when one must be engaged in one of the excepted occupations, in order to be exempt, is the date of the creditors' petition. *In re Interstate Paving Co.*, 171 Fed. 604. Hence this should also be the time when \$1000 must be owed, the two clauses in the same sentence offering no ground for distinction. Yet if courts adhered strictly to this requirement, the debtor would be enabled to settle with some creditors and leave the rest without remedy. In straining to avoid this result it has been held that voidable preferences are included among the creditors' debts at the time of the petition because they can be recovered by the trustee. *In re McMurtrey & Smith*, 142 Fed. 853. Yet such an assumption of the basis for bankruptcy is reasoning in a circle. Where a debtor, to avoid bankruptcy, goes into one of the exempt occupations, courts have made a judicial exception to the terms of the statute and refused him protection. *Tiffany v. La Plume Condensed Milk Co.*, 141 Fed. 444. See 23 HARV. L. REV. 393. Unfortunately there is equal necessity for judicial legislation in the case of preferences, and the principal case will undoubtedly be followed.

BANKRUPTCY — PROPERTY PASSING TO TRUSTEE — LIFE INSURANCE POLICIES. — A bankrupt had policies of insurance on his life payable to his executors, administrators, or assigns, on which the insurance company had a valid lien for a greater amount than their cash surrender value. The Bankruptcy Act, § 70 a (5), provides "that when any bankrupt shall have any insurance policy which has a cash surrender value payable to himself, his estate, or personal representatives, he may, within thirty days after the cash surrender value has